



# Patterns of sulfur isotope fractionation during microbial sulfate reduction

## Citation

Bradley, A.S., W.D. Leavitt, M. Schmidt, A.H. Knoll, P.R. Girguis, D.T. Johnston. 2015. Patterns of sulfur isotope fractionation by sulfate reducing bacteria. *Geobiology*. DOI: 10.1111/gbi.12149.

## Published Version

doi:10.1111/gbi.12149

## Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:30367425>

## Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#OAP>

## Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.  
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

**PATTERNS OF SULFUR ISOTOPE FRACTIONATION BY SULFATE  
REDUCING BACTERIA**

**Alexander S. Bradley<sup>1,\*†</sup>, William D. Leavitt<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Marian Schmidt<sup>2,3</sup>, Andrew H. Knoll<sup>2,4</sup>,  
Peter R. Girguis<sup>4</sup>, and David T. Johnston<sup>2</sup>**

*<sup>1</sup>Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Washington University in St. Louis, 1 Brookings  
Drive, St. Louis MO, 63130*

*<sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Harvard University, 20 Oxford Street, Cambridge  
MA 02138*

*<sup>3</sup>Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, 830 North University,  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109*

*<sup>4</sup>Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street,  
Cambridge MA 02138*

\*Correspondence to: *abradley at eps.wustl.edu*

†Authors contributed equally

*Running title: Ecophysiology of SRB S-isotope fractionation*

25

## 26 **ABSTRACT**

27       Studies of microbial sulfate reduction have suggested that the magnitude of sulfur isotope  
28 fractionation varies with sulfate concentration. Small apparent sulfur isotope fractionations  
29 preserved in Archean rocks have been interpreted as suggesting Archean sulfate concentrations  
30 of less than 200  $\mu\text{M}$ , while later larger fractionations have been interpreted to require higher  
31 sulfate concentrations. In this work, we demonstrate that isotope fractionation can sometimes  
32 vary with sulfate concentrations over a large range of concentrations, but that this relationship  
33 depends on the organism being studied. Two sulfate reducing bacteria grown in continuous  
34 culture between 0.1 and 6 mM sulfate showed markedly different relationships between sulfate  
35 concentration and isotope fractionation. *Desulfovibrio vulgaris* str. Hildenborough cultures  
36 showed a large and relatively constant isotope fractionation ( $^{34}\epsilon_{\text{SO}_4\text{-H}_2\text{S}} \approx 25\%$ ) over the  
37 experimental range of sulfate concentrations. Over the same concentration range, fractionation  
38 by *Desulfovibrio alaskensis* strain G20 strongly correlated with sulfate. Both data sets can be  
39 modeled as Michaelis-Menten (MM) type relationships but with very different MM constants,  
40 suggesting that the fractionations imposed by these organisms respond in dramatically different  
41 ways to sulfate concentrations.

42       These data reveal complexity in the sulfate concentration-fractionation relationship.  
43 Sulfur isotope fractionation during sulfate reduction relates to environmental sulfate  
44 concentrations but also to strain-specific physiological parameters such as the affinity of sulfate-  
45 reducing microorganisms for sulfate and electron donors. Previous studies have suggested that  
46 the relationship between sulfate concentration and isotope fractionation is best fit with a MM fit.  
47 suggested We present a simple model, grounded in the physiology of sulfate reduction, in which  
48 the ratio of MM relationships for sulfate and electron donor uptake produces the relationships  
49 seen in experimental studies: a MM relationship with sulfate concentration, and a hyperbolic  
50 relationship with growth rate.

51       Since both environmental and biological factors influence the fractionation recorded in  
52 geological samples, understanding their relationship is critical to interpreting the sulfur isotope  
53 record. As the acquisition machinery for sulfate and electron acquisition has been subject to  
54 selective pressure over Earth history, its evolution may complicate efforts to uniquely reconstruct  
55 ambient sulfate concentrations from a single sulfur isotopic composition.

56

57 *Keywords: co-limitation and threshold effects; Michaelis-Menten; marine sulfate concentration;*

58 *Archean seawater*

59

60

61

## INTRODUCTION

Evolution of the marine sulfate reservoir is a key parameter in modeling Earth's surface oxidation state through time (Berner and Canfield, 1989; Canfield, 2004). Today, seawater sulfate represents an oxidant reservoir ten times the size of atmospheric O<sub>2</sub> (Hayes and Waldbauer, 2006). One of the most powerful tools for understanding the evolution of the sulfate reservoir, and by proxy the surface sulfur cycle, is the ratio of stable sulfur isotopes in sulfur-bearing minerals found in marine sedimentary rocks. Marine sulfate concentrations are linked to geological isotope records largely via microbial metabolism, most notably by microbial sulfate reduction (MSR), a metabolic process that couples organic carbon or hydrogen oxidation to sulfate reduction. Details of isotopic records permit the quantification of seawater sulfate through Earth history, but such inferences are predicated on a fundamental understanding of the broad suite of factors that influence the fractionation of sulfur isotopes during MSR.

MSR can yield a large mass-dependent fractionation between sulfate and sulfide (Chambers et al., 1975; Harrison and Thode, 1958; Leavitt et al., 2013; Sim et al., 2011c); the product sulfide is depleted in heavy isotopes, leaving the residual sulfate enriched. Both environmental and physiological factors contribute to the expressed fractionation. For example, Habicht et al. (2002) presented data suggesting that <sup>34</sup>S/<sup>32</sup>S fractionations greater than 5‰ are expressed only when ambient sulfate concentration exceeds 200 μM – approximately one percent of the modern seawater sulfate concentration. This concentration threshold is similar in magnitude to the sulfate half-saturation concentrations (*K<sub>s</sub>*) associated with growth kinetics of some MSR strains (Pallud and Van Cappellen, 2006; Tarpgaard et al., 2011). When paired with Precambrian sedimentary sulfur isotope record, this fractionation threshold value was taken to imply an increase in seawater sulfate concentrations near the Archean – Proterozoic boundary, where a dramatic expansion of S-isotope fractionation is preserved (Habicht et al., 2002). This, in turn, suggests a strong physiological control on the geological isotope record (Habicht et al., 2002; Habicht et al., 2005; Szabo et al., 1950) and implies that as microbial physiologies are better understood, more refined geological storylines are possible.

Microbial physiology provides the context for mechanistically evaluating how low sulfate concentrations limit sulfur isotope fractionation. Extensive work on the sulfate uptake half-saturation constant ( $K_s$ ) demonstrates a range of uptake capacities in natural communities and pure cultures alike (see compilations in (Pallud and Van Cappellen, 2006; Tarpgaard et al., 2011). For instance, it was originally intuited that microbes that evolved in and adapted to lacustrine environments with low ambient sulfate concentrations will have low  $K_s$  values, with the opposite posited for marine strains (Bak and Pfennig, 1991; Holmer and Storkholm, 2001). However, in natural samples, measured  $K_s$  values show no clear relationship with salinity; freshwater and marine sediments have apparently similar ranges of  $K_s$  (see review in Tarpgaard et al. (2011)). That said, low  $K_s$  values have been observed more frequently in freshwater cultures than in marine cultures (Tarpgaard et al., 2011). Further, Tarpgaard et al. (2011) demonstrate that individual microbial strains within a community can have different apparent  $K_s$  values for sulfate, lessening the validity of using the realized  $K_s$  as a proxy for the all members of a given environment. This is also consistent with genomic analyses (Hauser et al., 2011; Heidelberg et al., 2004), which suggest that individual microbial strains may carry multiple sulfate transporters, possibly of varying sulfate  $K_s$  and  $V_{max}$  (maximal transport rate). Such complexity suggests that a single measure of cellular  $K_s$  is an imperfect guide to the concentration-dependence of fractionation. As such, the relationship between sulfate concentration/activity, transport, and isotope fractionation is likely more complex than a simple and universal sulfate concentration threshold value and related step-function change in sulfur isotope fractionation.

It should also be noted that sulfate transporters enable sulfate-reducing microorganisms to compete for sulfate as a function of both the cellular half-saturation constant,  $K_s$ , and of the maximum rate of cellular sulfate uptake,  $V_{max}$ . It is important to appreciate that  $V_{max}$  itself is also a function of the number and characteristics of sulfate ion transporters in the cell membrane (Aksnes and Egge, 1991). Much work suggests that the appropriate parameter to describe the cellular uptake efficiency for any ion – including sulfate – is the affinity parameter  $A_s$ , which is  $V_{max} / K_s$  (Aksnes and Egge, 1991; Button, 1985; Healey, 1980; Smith et al., 2009). This term captures the influence of both the maximal rate of transport and the half-saturation constant. As strains with a higher  $A_s$  are able to import sulfate more efficiently into the cell, the opportunity for isotope fractionation should increase; at low transport velocities (i.e. sulfate import rates),

transported sulfate is likely to be quantitatively reduced to sulfide, which due to mass balance would minimize isotopic fractionation.

In this study we report results from two sets of continuous-culture experiments, each employing an axenic strain of sulfate-reducing bacteria. We examine pure strains rather than enrichment cultures or diverse sedimentary communities in order to avoid complexities introduced by multiple competing strains, each with potentially different sulfate affinities and transport kinetics. In each set of experiments, the bacterial population was cultivated at steady state under a range of different sulfate concentrations (0.1 to 6 mM) in order to assay the relationship between sulfate concentration and isotope fractionation. The freshwater (*Desulfovibrio vulgaris* str. Hildenborough) and marine (*Desulfovibrio alaskensis* str. G20) strains selected are among the most well studied sulfate reducers (Hansen, 1994; Pereira et al., 2011; Wall et al., 1993). Each strain has a fully sequenced genome (Hauser et al., 2011; Heidelberg et al., 2004), is genetically tractable, and is biochemically well-characterized (Grein et al., 2013; Venceslau et al., 2014), providing a wide range of tools for follow-up investigations.

To date, previous physiological work has reported one sulfate  $K_s$  for *D. vulgaris* at 0.032 mM (Ingvorsen and Jørgensen, 1984). The genome of *D. vulgaris* (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>) further contains three annotated sulfate transport proteins. In contrast, *D. alaskensis* has no reported  $K_s$ ; however, closely related strains have values ranging from 0.005 mM to greater than 0.250 mM (Dalsgaard and Bak, 1994; Fukui and Takii, 1994; Okabe et al., 1992). The *D. alaskensis* genome contains at least 10 sulfate transporters; unknown transport proteins are also present and may increase this estimate. Such redundancy is consistent with the notion that a range of sulfate affinities can be exhibited in a single strain or environment (Tarpgaard et al., 2011). Here we present the experimental design and results, consider potential physiological and environmental factors that can explain the observed differences, and discuss the ramifications of these data on interpretations of the geological sulfur isotope record.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS SUMMARY

Each strain (*D. alaskensis* and *D. vulgaris*) was grown in stirred continuous culture vessels held at room temperature (25 °C) for roughly 40 days. We employed a continuous flow bioreactor to avoid the complexities of closed-system Rayleigh distillation effects incurred during growth in batch culture (Leavitt et al., 2013). In continuous culture at steady state, concentration of the limiting substrate (in this case, lactate) remains invariant and is a function of dilution rate; the growth rate ( $\mu$  day<sup>-1</sup>) is also constant and equal to the dilution rate ( $D$  day<sup>-1</sup>). This design allowed us to match *D. vulgaris* and *D. alaskensis* growth rates at  $0.037 \pm 0.003$  and  $0.034 \pm 0.001$  (days<sup>-1</sup>), respectively. Growth rate and biomass yield were modulated with lactate as the limiting substrate. Any variability recorded in these experiments should, thus, primarily reflect the isotopic response to changing sulfate concentrations. Our approach allows us to measure the fractionation behavior of MSR at constant growth rates over a range of sulfate concentrations (0.1 to 6.1 mM).

Sulfate and lactate were supplied to the bioreactors at rates necessary to achieve media concentrations from 0.5 to 10 mM. As the limiting nutrient, standing lactate concentrations in the chemostats were a function of dilution rate. The reactor vessel was continuously purged with a pre-conditioned (O<sub>2</sub>-free and hydrated) anaerobic gas mixture (N<sub>2</sub>:CO<sub>2</sub>, 90:10), which also served to carry gas phase sulfide out of the reactor to a series of zinc acetate traps. Reactor pH was maintained at  $7.0 \pm 0.02$  via a pH-probe activated titration pump, which dosed either 1M HCl or 1M NaOH as appropriate (N<sub>2</sub>-degassed and autoclave-sterilized). From the effluent, concentrations of lactate/acetate and sulfate/sulfide were measured daily along with optical density and all (gas and liquid) flow rates. Our reported concentrations are those measured from the chemostat effluent, and represent the effective concentration of sulfate in the reactor. Steady-state sulfate concentrations were measured directly from the bioreactor effluent, and represent the concentration available to the population (lower than the concentration of the inlet media). The fractionations of interest ( $^{34}\epsilon$  and  $^{33}\lambda$ ) are thus between reactant sulfate and product sulfide, both collected from the effluent. For isotopic analysis, all samples were measured for  $\delta^{34}\text{S}$  via SO<sub>2</sub> and select samples were fluorinated to SF<sub>6</sub> and measured for high precision  $\delta^{33}\text{S}$  analysis (Johnston et al., 2005). Carbon and sulfur mass balances were always satisfied to within 2%. Growth rate was determined given growth data (cells/mL or A600/mL) with respect to the dilution rate ( $D$  day<sup>-1</sup>), and only samples satisfying a steady-state flow regime (*see*



Supplemental Information) were included in the final analysis. All chemical, biological, and isotopic methods are described in the supplemental materials.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### CHEMOSTAT EXPERIMENTS

The isotopic fractionation between sulfate and sulfide is plotted in Figure 1 as a function of the standing sulfate concentration in the chemostat for both *D. vulgaris* and *D. alaskensis*. Experiments with *D. vulgaris* yielded a range of  $^{34}\epsilon_{D.vulgaris}$  from 18.0 to 32.7‰ over the targeted sulfate concentrations. Specifically,  $^{34}\epsilon_{D.vulgaris}$  shows no significant covariance between sulfate concentration and fractionation ( $p = 0.19$ ), meaning that there is no first-order dependence of fractionation on sulfate concentration between 0.1 and 5 mM. Furthermore, *D. vulgaris* demonstrates the capacity for significant isotope fractionation ( $^{34}\epsilon_{D.vulgaris}$  greater than 25‰, although with significant scatter) at sulfate concentrations as low as 0.1 mM. These data are consistent with a Michaelis-Menten type relationship between substrate concentration and fractionation (Habicht et al., 2005), with a  $K_{m\text{-frac}} = 0.0027$  mM (95% CI is 0 to 0.036 mM) and  $^{34}\epsilon_{\text{max}} = 25.8\text{‰}$  (95% CI is 23.4 to 28.3‰).  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  is defined as the sulfate concentration at which expressed fractionation is one-half of the maximum fractionation under constant conditions excepting variable sulfate concentrations (Habicht et al., 2005).

In contrast, experiments with strain *D. alaskensis* produce a  $^{34}\epsilon_{D.alaskensis}$  that varies systematically from near 0 to 13‰ as steady-state sulfate concentrations are increased. These data show strong co-variance, via the linear regression model:  $^{34}\epsilon = (2.2 \pm 0.1) \cdot [\text{SO}_4^{2-}] + (1.2 \pm 0.3)$ , with a  $p$ -value less than 0.001. This result is consistent with a first-order dependence of  $^{34}\epsilon_{D.alaskensis}$  on sulfate concentration over the range tested (0.1 to 6.1 mM). The data could also be fit with a Michaelis-Menten type relationship, with a half-saturation constant of  $K_{m\text{-frac}} = 8.9$  mM (95% CI is 2.2 to 15.7 mM) and  $^{34}\epsilon_{\text{max}}$  of 34.5‰, 95% CI is 16.8 to 52.3 ‰). Although comparison of the two models using a corrected Akaike's (AIC<sub>c</sub>) information criterion favors the linear model (62% likelihood), mechanistic considerations (see 'Evaluation of cellular  $K_s$ ') suggest that the Michaelis-Menten formulation is preferable. Taking the *D. vulgaris* and *D. alaskensis* experiments together, the strains exhibit strikingly different patterns in both the

magnitude of  $^{34}\epsilon$  and its dependence on ambient sulfate concentration (i.e. the Michaelis-Menten fitting parameters).

The relationship between sulfate concentration and isotopic fractionation ( $^{34}\epsilon$ ) described above and elsewhere (Habicht et al., 2002; Habicht et al., 2005) can be extended to include  $^{33}\text{S}$ . These data are presented in Figure 2 using two complementary minor isotope notations<sup>§</sup>:  $^{33}\lambda$  and  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$ . The  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$  notation is common in geological applications and is the deviation (in ‰ units) from a theoretical reference frame defined using the calculated low temperature thermodynamic equilibrium relationship between  $^{32}\text{S}$ ,  $^{33}\text{S}$ , and  $^{34}\text{S}$  where  $^{33}\lambda = 0.515$ . However, since  $^{33}\lambda$  is not constant across various processes a calculation of its value provides another measure of minor isotope variance – it can be envisioned as approximately the slope of the curve on a plot of  $\delta^{33}\text{S}$  vs.  $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ . Non-equilibrium processes can have slopes different than 0.515, most commonly less than 0.515 (Farquhar et al., 2003; Johnston et al., 2007). As both terms are widely used, we plot both  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$  and  $^{33}\lambda$  versus  $^{34}\epsilon$  (Fig. 2).

Previous studies targeting  $^{33}\lambda$  in open-system MSR experiments suggest that  $^{33}\lambda$  varies linearly with  $\delta^{34}\text{S}$  as a function of metabolic rate (Sim et al. 2011; Leavitt et al. 2013 (Wu and Farquhar, 2011)). As these slopes carry a metabolism-specific component (Johnston et al 2005), the inclusion of  $^{33}\text{S}$  extends the biogeochemical utility of S isotopes. Including  $^{33}\text{S}$  allows the effects of sulfate reduction to be discerned from those of sulfide oxidation or sulfur disproportionation. For example, the  $^{34}\epsilon_{D.alaskensis}$  values (0-13‰) expressed in our experiments by strain *D. alaskensis* are not unique to MSR, as sulfide oxidation reactions often produce  $^{34}\epsilon$  less than 10‰. However, the inclusion of  $^{33}\text{S}$  provides an additional isotopic constraint that can be used to trace the origin of sulfate and sulfide (Johnston et al., 2005). In our experiments,  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$  and  $^{33}\lambda$  both show a strong relationship with  $^{34}\epsilon$  (Fig. 2), and for  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$ :  $\Delta^{33}\text{S} = (0.0031 \pm 0.0003) * (^{34}\epsilon) + (0.20 \pm 0.01)$ ,  $p$ -value less than 0.0001. In this case AIC<sub>c</sub> favors a Michaelis-Menten type fit (89% likelihood) with a  $K_{m\text{-frac}} = 20.1\text{‰}$  [7.6 to 32.6 ‰] and  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}_{\text{max}} = 0.169\text{‰}$ , (95% CI 0.110 to 0.228 ‰). The  $^{33}\lambda - ^{34}\epsilon$  results for *D. alaskensis* and *D. vulgaris* fit within the context of previous work in which  $^{33}\lambda_{\text{MSR}}$  (dimensionless) spans a range from 0.508 to 0.514

<sup>§</sup> We use standard isotope notation, where  $\delta^{33}\text{S}$  is the ratio of  $^{33}\text{S}$  to  $^{32}\text{S}$  in a sample relative to a standard. We use  $^{34}\epsilon$  to capture the isotopic difference between sulfate and sulfide ( $= [^{34}\alpha - 1] 1000$ ). Minor isotope notation includes  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$  ( $= \delta^{33}\text{S} + 1000[\delta^{34}\text{S}/1000 + 1]^{0.515} - 1$ ), which relates a composition to a theoretical reference line, and  $^{33}\lambda$  ( $= \ln[^{33}\alpha]/\ln[^{34}\alpha]$ ), which is approximately the slope of the tangent to the curve of  $\delta^{33}\text{S}$  vs.  $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ .

(Farquhar et al. 2003; Johnston et al. 2005; 2007; Sim et al. 2011; Leavitt et al. 2013). In contrast, sulfide oxidation and sulfur disproportionation reactions result in  $^{33}\lambda$  greater than 0.5145 (Johnston et al., 2005; Zerkle et al., 2009). Therefore, these data support minor sulfur isotopes as a quantitative indicator of specific metabolism, despite control on fractionation of other experimental parameters like sulfate (e.g., temperature, MSR strain, etc.).

#### EVALUATION OF CELLULAR $K_s$ AS A PREDICTOR OF FRACTIONATION

These experiments demonstrate that different strains of sulfate reducing bacteria can show distinct relationships between sulfate concentration and isotope fractionation. The observed differences prompt a reexamination of previous data and reinvigorate the search for similar patterns. Harrison and Thode (1958) demonstrated a correlation between sulfate concentration and sulfur isotope fractionation with *D. desulfuricans*. More recent work using modified flow-through reactors (Habicht et al., 2002) and a recirculating chemostat (Habicht et al., 2005) shows a relationship in which  $^{34}\epsilon$  increases with sulfate concentration, and can be interpreted as asymptotically approaching a maximum value. This later work targeted the MSR *Archaeoglobus fulgidus*, a hyperthermophilic Archaea. In those studies, growth and cell specific sulfate reduction rate (csSRR) were controlled through organic carbon limitation, and the threshold effect of sulfate concentrations (i.e., a step function) was observed. The authors modeled this asymptotic behavior with an equation identical in form to a Michaelis-Menten equation although a linear fit to these data cannot be excluded without a theoretical justification (see below). The half-saturation constant in this fractionation equation ( $K_{m\text{-frac}}$ ) is then defined as the concentration of sulfate at which the modeled fractionation was one-half the maximum fractionation. The value of  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  for sulfate was similar in magnitude to the Michaelis-Menten half-saturation constant ( $K_s$ ) for sulfate-limited growth. The similarity in these constants inspired the proposition that  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  and  $K_s$  are directly (linearly) related, implying that the half saturation constant carries an isotopic – and perhaps geologic – fingerprint (Habicht et al., 2002).

A Michaelis-Menten -like mathematical relationship correctly predicts the fractionation pattern displayed by *D. vulgaris*. Previous work indicates a  $K_s$  for sulfate in *D. vulgaris* near 0.03 mM (Ingvorsen and Jørgensen, 1984), well below the sulfate concentrations in our experiments. If  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  is of a similar magnitude, as predicted by our measurements at millimolar sulfate, then at our minimum sulfate concentration of 0.1 mM, we expect to observe more than

90% of the maximum fractionation under the specific experimental conditions (i.e. csSRR and chemostat dilution rate) employed (Fig. 1; *see* Materials and Methods). Only a modest increase in fractionation would accompany further increases in sulfate concentrations, consistent with our observations for *D. vulgaris*. Changes in csSRR would have more dramatic consequences.

In contrast, a Michaelis-Menten-like equation can only explain the experimental results for strain *D. alaskensis* if the  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  is quite large - greater than the experimental window investigated here ( $K_{m\text{-frac}} = 8.9$  mM, 95% CI is 2.2 to 15.7 mM). We are unaware of any published sulfate  $K_s$  values from strain *D. alaskensis* specifically, although  $K_s$  values from related strains (*D. desulfuricans*) are consistently less than 0.5 mM (Tarpgaard et al., 2011) – eighteen-fold lower than would be required if  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  and  $K_s$  are to be similar. Given that the *D. alaskensis* genome contains at least 10 putative sulfate transporters, the cellular  $K_s$  for sulfate is likely highly dependent on growth conditions. One plausible explanation for the observed result is that under these conditions *D. alaskensis* expresses only low affinity sulfate transporters, and that a functional relationship between  $K_s$  and  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  holds. Indeed, a sulfate  $K_s$  of this magnitude is within the upper limits of published  $K_s$  values for sulfate (Fukui and Takii, 1994; Ingvorsen et al., 1984; Pallud and Van Cappellen, 2006; Roychoudhury, 2004; Tarpgaard et al., 2011).

These new data highlight the fact that the relationship between cellular  $K_s$  for sulfate and isotope fractionation remains unclear, and affinity ( $A_s$ ) may be a more appropriate term to use when examining MSR in the context of environmental conditions. While  $K_s$  values for sulfate are directly related to the kinetics of growth under sulfate-limited conditions, experiments on the fractionation of sulfur isotopes are generally executed under electron donor limitation or co-limitation of sulfate and electron donor (e.g., this study, Habicht et al. 2002, 2005). Growth and sulfate reduction rates are therefore directly related to the affinity ( $A_s$ ) for the electron donor relative to that of sulfate, rather than simply sulfate concentrations. Sulfate  $K_s$  pertains only to the cellular half-saturation constant for sulfate and may affect fractionation, particularly when sulfate is *not* growth-limiting. In more detail, sulfate transport in sulfate-reducing microorganisms is strictly regulated, and is accomplished via numerous possible mechanisms. These include  $H^+$  and  $Na^+$  symporters, which rely on concentration gradients and do not require ATP (Cypionka, 1995), whereas there also exist ATP-dependent ABC-type active transporters that pump sulfate into the cell against a concentration gradient (Piłsyk and Paszewski, 2009) and

are homologous to enzymes for assimilatory sulfate transport in other (non-sulfate-reducing) microorganisms. Energetic considerations favor the symporters as the primary transport mechanism for dissimilatory metabolism (Cypionka, 1995). Regulation of various transporters with different affinities (Cypionka, 1995; Tarpgaard et al., 2011) probably allows the cells to adapt to various sulfate concentrations; with high-affinity transporters up-regulated at low sulfate concentrations and vice versa. Therefore, one plausible explanation for the apparently divergent patterns in Fig. 1 is that transport mechanisms differ between *D. vulgaris* and *D. alaskensis*. For example, if under similar conditions *D. vulgaris* expressed high affinity sulfate transporters, its intracellular concentration of sulfate could remain elevated and allow fractionation to be maximized. The pattern seen in *D. alaskensis* may reflect lower affinity transporters, or a variation in the affinity of expressed transporters as sulfate concentrations are changed. There may, of course, be other differences in each strain's ability to import sulfate and electron donors that are not represented herein, and future studies should be designed to interrogate the means by which these and other strains acquire sulfate over a range of environmentally relevant conditions.

Since it has been demonstrated that fractionation is a function both of sulfate concentration (Habicht et al., 2002) and specific sulfate reduction rate (Chambers and Trudinger, 1975; Harrison and Thode, 1958; Leavitt et al., 2013; Sim et al., 2011c), it would be useful to understand the interaction of these two variables. Both can be related to the cellular machinery for sulfate reduction by comparing the independent rates of sulfate and electron supply to the cell (Bradley et al., 2011). Sulfur isotope fractionation will be maximized when intracellular sulfate concentrations are unlimited and electron supplies are limited. This is the situation that occurs at very low growth rates: electron donor limits the growth rate, but if sulfate is not limiting then cellular transport of sulfate should not be limiting either. We can conceptualize this growth state as a high supply of sulfate relative to electrons.

Conversely, sulfur isotope fractionation will be minimized if sulfate supply is limiting. If cells are able to obtain sufficient electrons to quantitatively reduce sulfate to sulfide, then expressed fractionation will be zero. This situation occurs when cells import electrons (via electron donors) sufficiently quickly that all imported sulfate is reduced to sulfide. The relationship between sulfur delivery and electron delivery is mechanistically expressed at key enzymes in the sulfate reduction pathway. For example, the enzyme dissimilatory sulfite

reductase requires three components to function (Figure 4): i) electrons, delivered via an intracellular electron carrier, ii) sulfite

Therefore, to a first order fractionation is proportional to the rate at which sulfate can be imported into the cell, and inversely proportional to the rate at which electrons are imported into the cell.

$$[1] \quad {}^{34}\epsilon \sim \frac{v_{sulfate}}{v_{electrons}}$$

where  ${}^{34}\epsilon$  is the expressed fractionation,  $v_{sulfate}$  is the rate at which sulfate is supplied to the cell. This rate is dependent on the kinetics of sulfate transporters, and is classically approximated as an Michaelis-Menten relationship:

$$[2] \quad v_{sulfate} = \frac{v_{max}^{sulfate} [SO_4^{2-}]}{K_s^{sulfate} + [SO_4^{2-}]}$$

The rate of sulfate reduction is similarly controlled, in a cell with excess sulfate, by the rate of electron supply to the reduction machinery. The rate that electron donors are imported can similarly be modeled as a Michaelis-Menten relationship, with different kinetic parameters for different electron donors. However, for the purposes of understanding fractionation the important parameter is the rate that electrons are supplied for the reduction of sulfate. This rate is proportional to the cell-specific sulfate reduction rate:

$$[3] \quad v_{electrons} \sim csSRR$$

Combining these two relationships, the observed fractionation is proportional to the MM relationship for sulfate import, times the inverse of the cell-specific sulfate reduction rate.

$$[4] \quad {}^{34}\epsilon \sim \frac{v_{max}^{sulfate} [SO_4^{2-}]}{K_s^{sulfate} + [SO_4^{2-}]} \frac{1}{csSRR}$$

This relationship has two consequences, both of which have been demonstrated empirically: first, at a given csSRR the relationship between sulfate concentration and sulfur isotope fractionation follows a curve that can be represented as a Michaelis-Menten curve (Habicht et al., 2005); second, at a given sulfate concentration the relationship between csSRR and fractionation is a nonlinear (hyperbolic) function of csSRR (Desmond-Le Quémener and Bouchez, 2014; Leavitt et al., 2013; Sim et al., 2011c; Wing and Halevy, 2014). This equation can be related to that given by Habicht et al. (2005), where

358 [5] 
$$^{34}\epsilon = \frac{\epsilon_{\max} [\text{SO}_4^{2-}]}{K_{m\text{-frac}} + [\text{SO}_4^{2-}]} = \frac{V_{\max}^{\text{sulfate}} [\text{SO}_4^{2-}]}{K_s^{\text{sulfate}} + [\text{SO}_4^{2-}]} \frac{\gamma}{v_{\text{sr}}}$$

359 and where  $\gamma$  represents a factor for the conversion from rate to fractionation; this may differ  
 360 from one strain to another. In this formulation  $K_s$  and  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  are related, but distinct, values and  
 361 the relationship between them depends on both the strains involved and the csSRR. In this  
 362 formulation,  $\epsilon_{\max}$  (and therefore  $\gamma$ ) is a function of csSRR, with a maximum value at low rates  
 363 resulting in a fractionation equivalent to the thermodynamic equilibrium fractionation factor  
 364 between sulfate and sulfide.

365 Given a single strain and concentration of electron donor, as is the case with our  
 366 chemostat experiments, sulfate reduction rate is invariant, and the variation in fractionation  
 367 would approximate a Michaelis-Menten curve on sulfate concentration, as shown by Habicht et  
 368 al. (2005) (Figure 5A). Moreover, the apparent  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$  need not be the same from strain to strain,  
 369 and this is reflected in the data herein on *D. vulgaris* and *D. alaskensis* at the same SRR. The  
 370 value primarily depends on both the strain-specific half-saturation constant for sulfate and the  
 371 kinetic parameters related to transport of the electron donor. High sulfate concentrations and low  
 372 growth rates (as limited by electron donor) both drive fractionations towards maximum  
 373 (equilibrium-like) values. At constant sulfate concentrations, the relationship between  
 374 fractionation and csSRR would have the hyperbolic relationship shown in Figure 5B and  
 375 demonstrated in previous studies (Leavitt et al., 2013; Sim et al., 2011c). This hyperbolic  
 376 relationship is conceptually similar to the relationship between carbon dioxide concentrations  
 377 and  $^{13}\epsilon$  discrimination against carbon isotopes demonstrated during carbon assimilation (Laws et  
 378 al., 1995; Popp et al., 1998). However, that is a linear relationship since  $\text{CO}_2$  assimilation and  
 379 growth rate are directly related.

380

### 381 **FACTORS GOVERNING S ISOTOPE FRACTIONATION BY SRB**

382 We propose that controls on S isotopic fractionation can generally be divided into four  
 383 regimes, only a subset of which have been the foci of experimental research to date (Figure 6).  
 384 Within each regime, transport and physiological factors will affect observed fractionation.

385 *Sulfate limitation:* in this regime, sulfate (terminal electron acceptor) availability limits  
 386 the rate of sulfate reduction. Due to quantitative, or near-quantitative reduction of sulfate,

expressed fractionation is small or may even carry a small inverse isotope effect (Harrison and Thode, 1958).

*Electron donor limitation:* In this case, both sulfate concentration and csSRR are relevant to determining fractionation factors. At lower sulfate concentrations this parameter is still influential on fractionation so long as sulfate is not being quantitatively reduced (Regime I), while at higher sulfate concentrations (28mM, i.e. higher than two times the  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$ ), rate is primarily determined by electron donor availability. This is the regime that is the focus of most studies on the magnitude of sulfur isotope fractionation (Chambers and Trudinger, 1975; Kaplan and Rittenberg, 1964; Leavitt et al., 2013; Sim et al., 2011a; Sim et al., 2011c).

*Substrate co-limitation:* Concentrations of both sulfate and electron donor are low relative to the cellular affinities. Growth rate in this case may be a second-order function that relates to the concentration and affinity of both substrates, or it may be the minimum growth rate predicted by either parameter (Liebig's law: (Saito et al., 2008)). Under these conditions, the expressed fractionation is likely to be a compound function of physiology and environment – making fractionation difficult to uniquely predict. Moreover, large fractionations are not excluded from this regime (Wing and Halevy, 2014), and significant fractionations have been observed at low sulfate concentrations (Canfield et al., 2010; Crowe et al., 2014; Gomes and Hurtgen, 2013; Nakagawa et al., 2012). If limitation of one constituent exerts ultimate control, then the system reverts to regime 1 or 2.

*Nutrient or physical limitation(s):* There can be other nutrients or factors – such as nitrogen, iron, or phosphorous limitation (Sim et al., 2012), a physical factor (e.g. temperature, (Canfield et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2007)) or an intrinsic organismal factor that limits growth rate and fractionation. The rate—fractionation relationship has been demonstrated for electron donor/acceptor (Canfield, 2001; Chambers et al., 1975; Kaplan and Rittenberg, 1964; Leavitt et al., 2013; Sim et al., 2011a; Sim et al., 2011c) and for nutrients (Sim et al., 2012), and can plausibly extend to other parameters. Where growth rates are controlled by factors intrinsic to the cell (e.g. in most batch culture experiments, during early log-phase growth), expressed fractionations are likely to reflect rates of intracellular electron transport to electron-accepting sulfur intermediates, described above (Bradley et al., 2011). Under severely limited conditions it may be possible to approach equilibrium isotope fractionations (Wing and Halevy, 2014).



These regimes indicate that multiple interactions ultimately control the sulfur isotope fractionation expressed by any given organism in any particular environment. As mentioned above, one physiological component not yet explored is the potential for organisms to carry multiple sulfate uptake machineries of varying affinities. For example, as sulfate is consumed through a typical marine sedimentary early diagenetic profile (Jorgensen, 1979), the sulfate concentrations available for MSR vary from 28 to less than 1 mM. Possessing high affinity sulfate transporters may confer a selective advantage at low concentrations, whereas low affinity transporters may confer an advantage at high ambient sulfate. A recent study identified both high and low affinity uptake mechanisms through a sulfate-methane transition zone profile in marine sediments (Tarpgaard et al., 2011), showing that large differences in affinity are possible even within the microbial community from a specific environment. Optimization of cellular machinery for the acquisition of metabolites is observed in other metabolic processes. For example, carbon fixation by RuBisCO is optimized to intracellular CO<sub>2</sub>/O<sub>2</sub> ratios (Tcherkez et al., 2006). The genome of *D. vulgaris* (Heidelberg et al., 2004) contains three annotated sulfate transport proteins, while the genome of *D. alaskensis* contains at least ten (Hauser et al., 2011). This redundancy is consistent with a potential range of affinities and could be further extended if unknown transport proteins are also present. In a microbial community with a mixture of organisms, each with a potential range of transporters, the overall observed fractionation will depend on how each member of the community processes sulfate and discriminate against its heavier isotopes.

An apparent range in affinities of enzymatic machinery for sulfate sets in place a prediction for an affinity continuum at the organismic level. The  $V_{max}/K_s$  expressed under any set of conditions is physiologically dependent and may incorporate feedbacks sensitive to sulfate concentration. The presence of both high and low affinity uptake mechanisms, at the cellular and community scales, is relevant to interpretation of the geochemical record. Continuing research will need to identify the full genetic and enzymatic controls on sulfate affinity in a variety of organisms, as well as the selective pressures to which these controls respond. In the future, more robust geochemical interpretations of sulfur isotopes may be achieved by furthering our understanding of how sulfate affinity has evolved in response to changing marine redox conditions and oxidant budgets (i.e. sulfate availability due to oxidative weathering), and how this evolution has influenced the sulfur isotope record. A high affinity for sulfate would have

been particularly advantageous early in Earth history, with the requirement becoming more relaxed as the Earth's surface became more oxidizing and sulfate more plentiful. That is, natural selection has likely altered dominant patterns of sulfur isotope fractionation over the course of Earth history. A genomic memory of ancient high affinity machinery may still be present in modern lacustrine environments, or other factors such as ecological competition may continue to select for those capacities. As new genomes and tools for analyzing molecular evolution become available, these questions become more tractable.

## CONCLUSIONS

Understanding the paleoenvironmental information encoded in sulfur isotopes during sulfate reduction requires an understanding of how growth and physiology affect stable isotope fractionation (Bradley et al., 2011; Rees, 1973). De-convolving these effects becomes tractable through experimental and theoretical exploration, such as further elucidating the  $V_{\max}/K_s$  relationship ( $A_s$ ) with  $K_{m\text{-frac}}$ , which serves as a practical means of comparing fractionation data from different strains. It is clear that there is no unequivocal sulfate threshold concentration related to a step function in sulfur isotope fractionation across all strains, and it is unclear which strains, adapted to the modern environment, are the best proxies for Archean microbial processes. Described here as a physiological and kinetic phenomenon, our framework for understanding fractionation helps explain recent observations of large  $^{34}\epsilon$  in low sulfate lake systems (Gomes and Hurtgen, 2013; Nakagawa et al., 2012). If the fractionation by MSR is in fact linked to multiple environmental and physiological variables, where each exhibit complex and non-linear (MM-like) responses, then articulating a clear heuristic for interpreting geological records is more challenging. Using sulfur isotopes to constrain sulfate concentrations in the Archean ocean is challenging, since the physiological parameters (affinity towards sulfate and electron donor) of Archean microbes is unknown. Sulfate concentrations less than 200  $\mu\text{M}$  are one explanation for small fractionations. It is also possible that small fractionations resulted from microbes with physiologies more like *D. alaskensis* than like *D. vulgaris*. Another alternative for small fractionations in Archean seawater is that biological fractionations may have been large, but reservoir effects suppressed fractionation through reservoir effects {Crowe, 2014 #4561}. Independent approaches for understanding the chemistry of Archean seawater (Jamieson et al., 2012) (Halevy et al., 2010; Halevy et al., 2012) can help constrain sulfate concentrations and

480 shed light on the interpretation of sulfur isotopes in light of both seawater chemistry and  
481 evolution. A more complete understanding of the sulfur isotope record will rely on building a  
482 better understanding of the relevant enzymes, their expression and isotope fractionation in  
483 response to environmental variables, and their evolution over the course of Earth history.  
484  
485

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

Many thanks to Gill Geesey and Inês Cardoso-Pereira for providing cultures of *D. alaskensis* G20 and *D. vulgaris* Hildenborough, respectively. Andy Masterson, Erin Beirne, and Madeline Higgins provided expert analytical assistance. The authors acknowledge funding from NASA Exobiology Grant NNX07AV51G (to AHK, PRG and DTJ), NASA Astrobiology Institute (DTJ, AHK), the Microbial Sciences Initiative at Harvard (DTJ), NSF EAR Instrument and Facilities as well as Low Temperature Geochemistry and Geobiology (to DTJ), NSF Graduate Research Fellowship (WDL) and the Agouron Institute (ASB).

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**

Materials & Methods

Supplemental File 1 – *D. vulgaris* growth data

Supplemental File 2 – *D. alaskensis* growth data

## REFERENCES CITED

- Aksnes, D.L., Egge, J.K., 1991. A theoretical model for nutrient uptake in phytoplankton. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 70, 65-72.
- Bak, F., Pfennig, N., 1991. MICROBIAL SULFATE REDUCTION IN LITTORAL SEDIMENT OF LAKE CONSTANCE. *Fems Microbiology Ecology* 85, 31-42.
- Berner, R.A., Canfield, D.E., 1989. A new model for atmospheric oxygen over Phanerozoic time. *American Journal of Science* 289, 333-361.
- Bradley, A.S., Leavitt, W.D., Johnston, D.T., 2011. Revisiting the dissimilatory sulfate reduction network. *Geobiology* 9, 446-457.
- Button, D.K., 1985. Kinetics of nutrient-limited transport and microbial growth. *Microbiological reviews* 49, 270-297.
- Canfield, D., E., 2001. Isotope fractionation by natural populations of sulfate-reducing bacteria. 65, 1117-1124.
- Canfield, D.E., 2004. The evolution of the Earth surface sulfur reservoir. *American Journal of Science* 304, 839-861.
- Canfield, D.E., Farquhar, J., Zerkle, A.L., 2010. High isotope fractionations during sulfate reduction in a low-sulfate euxinic ocean analog. *Geology* 38, 415-418.
- Canfield, D.E., Olesen, C.A., Cox, R.P., 2006. Temperature and its control of isotope fractionation by a sulfate-reducing bacterium. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 70, 548-561.
- Chambers, L.A., Trudinger, P.A., 1975. Are thiosulfate and trithionate intermediates in dissimilatory sulfate reduction? *Journal of Bacteriology* 123, 36-40.
- Chambers, L.A., Trudinger, P.A., Smith, J.W., Burns, M.S., 1975. Fractionation of sulfur isotopes by continuous cultures of *Desulfovibrio desulfuricans*. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 21, 1602-1607.
- Crowe, S.A., Paris, G., Katsev, S., Jones, C., Kim, S.-T., Zerkle, a.L., Nomosatryo, S., Fowle, D.A., Adkins, J.F., Sessions, A.L., Farquhar, J., Canfield, D.E., 2014. Sulfate was a trace constituent of Archean seawater. *Science* 346, 735-739.
- Cypionka, H., 1995. Solute transport and cell energetics. In: L. Barton (Ed.), *Sulfate-Reducing Bacteria*, pp. 151-184. Plenum Press, New York.
- Dalsgaard, T., Bak, F., 1994. NITRATE REDUCTION IN A SULFATE-REDUCING BACTERIUM, DESULFOVIBRIO-DESULFURICANS, ISOLATED FROM RICE PADDY SOIL - SULFIDE INHIBITION, KINETICS, AND REGULATION. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 60, 291-297.
- Desmond-Le Quémener, E., Bouchez, T., 2014. A thermodynamic theory of microbial growth. *The ISME Journal* 8, 1747-1751.
- Farquhar, J., Johnston, D.T., Wing, B.A., Habicht, K.S., Canfield, D.E., Airieau, S., Thiemens, M.H., 2003. Multiple sulphur isotopic interpretations of biosynthetic pathways: implications for biological signatures in the sulphur isotope record. *Geobiology* 1, 27-36.
- Fukui, M., Takii, S., 1994. Kinetics of sulfate respiration by free-living and particle-associated sulfate-reducing bacteria. *Fems Microbiology Ecology* 13, 241-247.
- Gomes, M.L., Hurtgen, M.T., 2013. Sulfur isotope systematics of a euxinic, low-sulfate lake: evaluating the importance of the reservoir effect in modern and ancient oceans. *Geology* 41, 663-666.

- Grein, F., Ramos, A.R., Venceslau, S.S., Pereira, I.A.C., 2013. Unifying concepts in anaerobic respiration: insights from dissimilatory sulfur metabolism. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 1827, 145-160.
- Habicht, K.S., Gade, M., Thamdrup, B., Berg, P., Canfield, D.E., 2002. Calibration of sulfate levels in the Archean Ocean. *Science* 298, 2372-2374.
- Habicht, K.S., Salling, L., Thamdrup, B., Canfield, D.E., 2005. Effect of Low Sulfate Concentrations on Lactate Oxidation and Isotope Fractionation during Sulfate Reduction by *Archaeoglobus fulgidus* Strain Z. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 71, 3770-3777.
- Halevy, I., Johnston, D.T., Schrag, D.P., 2010. Explaining the structure of the Archean mass-independent sulfur isotope record. *Science* 329, 204-207.
- Halevy, I., Peters, S.E., Fischer, W.W., 2012. Sulfate Burial Constraints on the Phanerozoic Sulfur Cycle. *Science (New York, NY)* 337, 331-334.
- Hansen, T., 1994. Metabolism of sulfate-reducing prokaryotes. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek* 66, 165-185.
- Harrison, A., Thode, H., 1958. Mechanism of the bacterial reduction of sulphate from isotope fractionation studies. *Transactions of the Faraday Society* 54, 84-92.
- Hauser, L.J., Land, M.L., Brown, S.D., Larimer, F., Keller, K.L., Rapp-Giles, B.J., Price, M.N., Lin, M., Bruce, D.C., Detter, J.C., Tapia, R., Han, C.S., Goodwin, L.A., Cheng, J.F., Pitluck, S., Copeland, A., Lucas, S., Nolan, M., Lapidus, A.L., Palumbo, A.V., Wall, J.D., 2011. Complete Genome Sequence and Updated Annotation of *Desulfovibrio alaskensis* G20. *Journal of Bacteriology* 193, 4268-4269.
- Hayes, J.M., Waldbauer, J.R., 2006. The carbon cycle and associated redox processes through time. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 361, 931-950.
- Healey, F.P., 1980. Slope of the Monod equation as an indicator of advantage in nutrient competition. *Microbial Ecology* 5, 281-286.
- Heidelberg, J.F., Seshadri, R., Haveman, S.A., Hemme, C.L., Paulsen, I.T., Kolonay, J.F., Eisen, J.A., Ward, N., Methé, B., Brinkac, L.M., Daugherty, S.C., Deboy, R.T., Dodson, R.J., Durkin, A.S., Madupu, R., Nelson, W.C., Sullivan, S.A., Fouts, D., Haft, D.H., Selengut, J., Peterson, J.D., Davidsen, T.M., Zafar, N., Zhou, L., Radune, D., Dimitrov, G., Hance, M., Tran, K., Khouri, H., Gill, J., Utterback, T.R., Feldblyum, T.V., Wall, J.D., Voordouw, G., Fraser, C.M., 2004. The genome sequence of the anaerobic, sulfate-reducing bacterium *Desulfovibrio vulgaris* Hildenborough. *Nature Biotechnology* 22, 554-559.
- Holmer, M., Storkholm, P., 2001. Sulphate reduction and sulphur cycling in lake sediments: a review. *Freshwater Biology* 46, 431-451.
- Ingvorsen, K., Jørgensen, B.B., 1984. Kinetics of sulfate uptake by freshwater and marine species of *Desulfovibrio*. *Archives of Microbiology* 139, 61-66.
- Ingvorsen, K., Zehnder, A.J.B., Jørgensen, B.B., 1984. KINETICS OF SULFATE AND ACETATE UPTAKE BY *DESULFOBACTER-POSTGATEI*. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 47, 403-408.
- Jamieson, J.W., Wing, B.A., Farquhar, J., Hannington, M.D., 2012. Neoproterozoic seawater sulphate concentrations from sulphur isotopes in massive sulphide ore. *Nature Geoscience* 6, 61-64.

- Johnston, D., Farquhar, J., Canfield, D., 2007. Sulfur isotope insights into microbial sulfate reduction: When microbes meet models. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 71, 3929-3947.
- Johnston, D.T., Farquhar, J., Wing, B.A., Kaufman, A.J., Canfield, D.E., Habicht, K.S., 2005. Multiple sulfur isotope fractionations in biological systems: A case study with sulfate reducers and sulfur disproportionators. *American Journal of Science* 305, 645-660.
- Jorgensen, B.B., 1979. Theoretical model of the stable isotope distribution in marine sediments. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 43, 363-374.
- Kaplan, I., Rittenberg, S., 1964. Microbiological fractionation of sulfur isotopes. *Journal of General Microbiology* 34, 195-&.
- Laws, E.A., Popp, B.N., Bidigare, R.R., Kennicutt, M.C., Macko, S.A., 1995. Dependence of phytoplankton carbon isotopic composition on growth rate and [CO<sub>2</sub>]aq: theoretical considerations and experimental results. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 59, 1131-8.
- Leavitt, W.D., Halevy, I., Bradley, A.S., Johnston, D.T., 2013. Influence of sulfate reduction rates on the Phanerozoic sulfur isotope record. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, in press.
- Nakagawa, M., Ueno, Y., Hattori, S., Umemura, M., Yagi, A., Takai, K., Koba, K., Sasaki, Y., Makabe, A., Yoshida, N., 2012. Seasonal change in microbial sulfur cycling in monomictic Lake Fukami-ike, Japan. *Limnology and Oceanography* 57, 974-988.
- Okabe, S., Nielsen, P.H., Characklis, W.G., 1992. FACTORS AFFECTING MICROBIAL SULFATE REDUCTION BY DESULFOVIBRIO-DESULFURICANS IN CONTINUOUS CULTURE - LIMITING NUTRIENTS AND SULFIDE CONCENTRATION. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 40, 725-734.
- Pallud, C., Van Cappellen, P., 2006. Kinetics of microbial sulfate reduction in estuarine sediments. *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta* 70, 1148-1162.
- Pereira, I.A.C., Ramos, A.R., Grein, F., Marques, M.C., da Silva, S.M., Venceslau, S.S., 2011. A comparative genomic analysis of energy metabolism in sulfate reducing bacteria and archaea. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 2, Article 69.
- Piłsyk, S., Paszewski, A., 2009. Sulfate permeases—phylogenetic diversity of sulfate transport. *Acta Biocimica Polonica* 56, 375-384.
- Popp, B.N., Laws, E.A., Bridigare, R.R., Dore, J.E., Hanson, K.L., Wakeham, S.G., 1998. Effect of phytoplankton cell geometry on carbon isotopic fractionation. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 62, 69-77.
- Rees, C.E., 1973. Steady-state model for sulfur isotope fractionation in bacterial reduction processes. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 37, 1141-1162.
- Roychoudhury, A.N., 2004. Sulfate respiration in extreme environments: A kinetic study. *Geomicrobiology Journal* 21, 33-43.
- Saito, M.A., Goepfert, T.J., Ritt, J.T., 2008. Some thoughts on the concept of colimitation: Three definitions and the importance of bioavailability. *Limnology and Oceanography* 53, 276-290.
- Sim, M.S., Bosak, T., Ono, S., 2011a. Large Sulfur Isotope Fractionation Does Not Require Disproportionation. *Science (New York, NY)* 333, 74-77.
- Sim, M.S., Ono, S., Bosak, T., 2012. Effects of Iron and Nitrogen Limitation on Sulfur Isotope Fractionation during Microbial Sulfate Reduction. *Applied and environmental microbiology* 78, 8368-8376 %R 10.1128/AEM.01842-12.

- 636 Sim, M.S., Ono, S., Donovan, K., Templer, S.P., Bosak, T., 2011c. Effect of electron donors on  
637 the fractionation of sulfur isotopes by a marine *Desulfovibrio* sp. *Geochimica et*  
638 *Cosmochimica Acta* 75, 4244-4259.
- 639 Smith, S.L., Yamanaka, Y., Pahlow, M., Oschlies, A., 2009. Optimal uptake kinetics:  
640 physiological acclimation explains the pattern of nitrate uptake by phytoplankton in the  
641 ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 384, 1-12.
- 642 Szabo, A., Tudge, A., Macnamara, J., Thode, H.G., 1950. The distribution of S-34 in nature and  
643 the sulfur cycle. *Science* 111, 464-465.
- 644 Tarpgaard, I.H., Røy, H., Jørgensen, B.B., 2011. Concurrent low- and high-affinity sulfate  
645 reduction kinetics in marine sediment. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 75, 2997-3010.
- 646 Tcherkez, G.G.B., Farquhar, G.D., Andrews, T.J., 2006. Despite slow catalysis and confused  
647 substrate specificity, all ribulose biphosphate carboxylases may be perfectly optimized.  
648 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103, 7246-7251.
- 649 Venceslau, S.S., Stockdreher, Y., Dahl, C., Pereira, I.A.C., 2014. The "bacterial heterodisulfide"  
650 DsrC is a key protein in dissimilatory sulfur metabolism. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*  
651 1837, 1148-1164.
- 652 Wall, J.D., Rapp-Giles, B.J., Rousset, M., 1993. Characterization of a small plasmid from  
653 *Desulfovibrio desulfuricans* and its use for shuttle vector construction. *Journal of*  
654 *Bacteriology* 177, 4121-4128.
- 655 Wing, B.A., Halevy, I., 2014. The sulfur isotope phenotypes of sulfate-respiring bacteria and  
656 archaea. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, in press.
- 657 Wu, N., Farquhar, J., 2011. Metabolic rates and sulfur cycling in the geologic record.  
658 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 11217-11218.
- 659 Zerkle, A.L., Farquhar, J., Johnston, D.T., Cox, R.P., Canfield, D.E., 2009. Fractionation of  
660 multiple sulfur isotopes during phototrophic oxidation of sulfide and elemental sulfur by  
661 a green sulfur bacterium. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 73, 291-306.



## FIGURE CAPTIONS

**Figure 1. Sulfate concentrations in each chemostat experiment at steady-state and the resulting strain-specific major isotope fractionation between sulfate and sulfide ( $^{34}\epsilon_{\text{SO}_4/\text{H}_2\text{S}}$ ).** Samples for isotope measurements are taken at steady-state sulfate concentrations. Strain *Desulfovibrio vulgaris* Hildenborough (red) exhibits larger isotope effects across the full range of sulfate concentrations, whereas strain *Desulfovibrio alaskensis* strain G20 (blue) shows strong concentration dependence.

**Figure 2. Triple isotope data for variable sulfate chemostat experiments.** The left y-axis indicates  $^{33}\lambda$ , again plotted against  $^{34}\epsilon$  for *D. vulgaris* (blue circles) and *D. alaskensis* (green closed squares). The right y-axis shows  $\Delta^{33}\text{S}$ , plotted against  $^{34}\epsilon$  for *D. vulgaris* (red open circles) and *D. alaskensis* (red closed circles).


**Figure 3.** Comparison between our data (*D. vulgaris* in red and *D. alaskensis* in blue) and those generated in a semi-continuous culture apparatus by Habicht et al. (2002, 2005) (in black symbols), along with values from *D. desulphuricans* (green) from Harrison and Thode, (1958), from closed-system experiments. Data from Habicht et al. (2002, 2005) include enrichment (mixed) cultures from freshwater (diamonds) and marine (squares) environments, as well as pure culture studies on the hyperthermophilic Archaea, *Archaeoglobus fulgidis* strain Z (triangles).


**Figure 4:** The operation of sulfite reduction by Dsr: sulfite and electrons are supplied to the enzyme DsrAB, which is complexed with DsrC. Partially reduced sulfur is removed by DsrC, which cycles to membrane-bound DsrMKJOP where cellular energy is conserved. During this cycle, reduced S is released as  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$ .

**Figure 5: The relationship between sulfate concentration, csSRR, and expressed isotope fractionation.** A) relationship between sulfate concentration and isotope fractionation for a variety of sulfate reduction rates. The maximum fractionation at lowest csSRR approaches the equilibrium isotope fractionation between sulfate and sulfide. Concentrations are expressed in multiples of  $K_{\text{m-fraction}}$ . B) Relationship between maximum fractionation and csSRR, for a variety of

sulfate concentrations. the x-axis in (B) is equivalent to a vertical line intersecting the x-axis in (A). *inset* shows the relationship between the curves at different concentrations. This relationship follows a Monod curve (A).

**Figure 6: Four ecological regimes relevant to sulfur isotope fractionation.** The x-axis indicates increasing sulfate concentration while y-axis indicates increasing electron donor concentration. In growth under sulfate limitation, electron donor is in excess and fractionation is low. In growth under electron donor limitation, a large fractionation is expected, primarily as a function of slow growth. Co-limitation of sulfate and electron donor is likely to produce a complex physiological pattern that is not well understood. Nutrient or other growth limitation (e.g. temperature) suggests that both sulfate and donor will be abundant (as is typical at the beginning of batch growth experiments); isotope fractionations are expected to be intermediate in magnitude. Boundaries between these regimes are not sharp, and are expected to relate to the cellular affinity ( $A_s$ ) for these substrates.











FIGURE 3








FIGURE 4